

**From:** [Christina Walsh](#)  
**To:** [Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [David Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Michael Montgomery/R9/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Gregg Dempsey/LV/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Nicole Moutoux/R9/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Jane Diamond/R9/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Brian \(CA-24\) Miller](#); [LISA PINTO](#)  
**Subject:** Re: EPA Technical Stakeholder Group Meeting: June 2, 9am to Noon, Radisson Hotel  
**Date:** 05/28/2010 06:10 PM

---

Dear Craig,

i did not get a response from EPA other than through the PRA, where correspondence between DTSC and Mr. Hirsch indicated a promise by EPA to not provide assistance to our community so that Mr. Hirsch may remain the only technical resource. Why is our application not being accepted when multiple requests from this community have been received? Clearly there is interest which has been effectively bull-dozed by the workgroup leadership with the help of EPA. I feel it is highly inappropriate for EPA to deny two requests from this community based on a side-bar commitment to someone who lives hundreds of miles away who wishes to be the only resource for technical information to continue a nuclear agenda that is not necessarily in keeping with actual clean-up of the site. We, the people below the site have been waiting decades for clean-up and these recent actions to block and prolong, indicate that the public's best interests are not being served.

Promise after promise, the community surrounding the site is taking a back-seat to politics, very disappointing.

I continue to be very disappointed in the leadership running the workgroup "stage-show" where the community is not allowed a voice in any meaningful way, and EPA only supports this format where only one view is heard? After ten years and more work toward investigating and researching the site than most anyone, I no longer feel the workgroup represents me, or my interests as an affected community member. I just cannot support this continued waste of time and money and being told it's for us. It is a farce. I do not accept the workgroup as a legitimate process for the public, as my discussions with EPA indicate a total unwillingness to lead as Chair despite the directive in the Charter to do just that.

To deny the many requests to change this format by community members who have been dismissed from the process, just show that EPA commitment for transparency does not include the workgroup process for this community, and we are wondering why? After multiple requests for other technical resources so that we may have a more balanced source of information, EPA continues to not hear the voice of concern by the community all because of political promises to keep political pressures off EPA. What about the people who are supposed to be served by this project?

I hereby request the official denial letter from November, and request that you provide me the administrative file that decision is based on. Please let me know when I can expect the file and consider this a FOIA request at this time. Please include any/all correspondence related to this decision, both internally and to the workgroup membership this decision was designed to protect.

I have read the law, and the CAG stands, and we will be forming, and do not need "approval" by DTSC as that is no where in the handbook, or in the Health and Safety Code, so it will be the People's CAG out of necessity of the community to step up to get their questions answered. We will have our "kickoff" meeting in June and I hope you can make it. It will be held at a neighboring park with all charter and application information for potential CAG participants. I'll let you know the date, once confirmed.

Once we are formed, we will expect the same respect as all the other groups that EPA and DTSC presents to, including the same presentations provided to the workgroup and other exclusive groups that don't allow outside participation such as the West Hills Neighborhood Council (where EPA has also presented), and look forward to hearing presentations from EPA based on the questions driven by the CAG. Please confirm to me that you will be treating us like all other interested groups and will attend where feasible meetings and provide the advisory group answers to questions related to the nuclear and chemical investigation and clean-up of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory based on the topics developed by the formed CAG.

Thank you in advance,  
Christina Walsh  
cleanuprocketdyne.org

On May 28, 2010, at 4:54 PM, [Cooper.Craig@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cooper.Craig@epamail.epa.gov) wrote:

Hi Christina - Per the Agenda for our June 2nd meeting, Nicole and I want to discuss this issue of "sharing comments" with everyone as a group. As for TASC, EPA is not accepting requests for a TASC consultant at this time. Did you get David Cooper's letter of November 30th, 2009 on this subject? Just in case you did not, I will bring a copy down to the June 2nd meeting. I also have the aerial photo final report on disk and will provide a copy to you and Bill at the June 2nd meeting as well.

Have a great weekend and see you next week.

Craig

=====  
Craig Cooper  
Superfund Project Manager  
U.S. EPA Region 9  
(415) 947-4148 (ph)  
(415) 947-3520 (fax)

From: Christina Walsh <[cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org](mailto:cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org)>  
To: Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 05/27/2010 08:17 PM  
Subject: Re: EPA Technical Stakeholder Group Meeting: June 2, 9am to Noon, Radisson Hotel

---

why are these comment responses being done so we cannot see who's comments are who's? I find it frustrating that our participation in this process is made less effective by purposely making it unclear as to who's comments are being considered. It is important to me to see who's comments are being considered and who is providing comments on these issues. This is very disappointing.

I also never heard from you on the TASC program. Are the requests from our community for TASC technical assistance being accepted or not?  
I look forward to your response.  
Christina

On May 27, 2010, at 6:20 PM, [Cooper.Craig@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cooper.Craig@epamail.epa.gov) wrote:

Dear EPA Technical Stakeholder Group:

Our next Stakeholder Group meeting is set for **June 2** at the **Radisson Hotel** in Chatsworth. This time we would like to start at **9:00am** and finish by Noon, if possible.

The agenda for our June 2 meeting is as follows:

1. Response to Stakeholder Comments on the Draft Water Field Sampling Plan ( 1 hour)
2. Response to Stakeholder Comments on the Draft Technical Memorandum for Historical Site Assessment Sub-Area 5C (1 hour)
3. Quick Updates on EPA Project (30 minutes)
  - Background Study
  - Gamma Scanning
  - Analytical Laboratory Procurement for Area IV Project
  - Project Schedule
4. Administrative Issues Regarding our Stakeholder Group (10 minutes)
  - Sharing of Comments on EPA documents

Attached to this email are two PDF documents: EPA's draft response to stakeholder comments on the Water Field Sampling Plan and EPA's draft response to stakeholder comments on the HSA 5C Tech Memo. As you can tell from the agenda above, the majority of our time on June 2<sup>nd</sup> will be dedicated to discussing key Stakeholder comments and the direction EPA is going with its responses. As EPA's first round of groundwater testing is being scheduled for this July, it is important that we reach closure on stakeholder comments on groundwater testing. With respect to HSA 5C Tech Memo, EPA received many excellent comments and EPA will make major edits to the Tech Memo and re-issue it.

The EPA Team looks forward to our June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and continued progress on our project. If you have any questions at this point, please let me, Nicole or Mary know. Otherwise, we will see you on June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Sincerely,  
Craig

=====  
Craig Cooper  
Superfund Project Manager  
U.S. EPA Region 9  
(415) 947-4148 (ph)  
(415) 947-3520 (fax)

<Water\_FSP\_Comments\_5\_27\_10\_r2.pdf><HSA-5C\_TM\_Response to  
Stakeholder Comments.pdf>